

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated January 12, 2006. With this amendment claims 1, 2, 25 and 35 are amended, claims 3-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 30-32 and 40-42 are cancelled, new claims 44-47 are presented, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

On May 4, 2006 an interview was held between the Examiner and Nathan Rau and Steven Koehler (for the Applicant). During this interview the claims and prior art were discussed. Further various parts of the present application were also discussed. The present amendments to the claims are based on the discussions contained in this interview. The Examiner indicated that these amendments would assist in promoting the prosecution.

In view of the amendments in the present amendment it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references teach or suggest, taken singly or in combination the features of the present claims as amended. In particular none of the cited references disclose generating the selected image for the frame from a composite of the set of representative images based on the geometric component, wherein the selected image and each of the set of representative images comprises a plurality of subregions defined adjacent to each other, and wherein generating a geometric component is performed for each subregion. Further none of the prior art teaches or suggests generating the geometric component based on a convex hull for each of the subregions.

In particular, in the previous office actions the Examiner rejected the above claims under 35 USC §102. The applicant reasserts the arguments made in the previous amendment vis-à-vis the Cosatto reference. Specifically, Cosatto et al. merely blends different parts of the face together to form a face.

Cosatto et al. do not generate anything equivalent to the geometric component as recited by claim 1, and certainly do not generate the geometric component from a set of representative images, where each image of the set has the identified feature points. In other words the set of images is not different parts of the face as used in Cosatto et al., rather it is variations of images having the same feature points. Moulton does not provide this deficiency.

Further, as claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include additional features not taught or suggested by the references. Specifically, claims 1 and 25 include limitations of their respective dependent claims. In particular the limitation of blending the texture at the boundaries of the plurality of subregions has been added. As discussed in the previous amendments Moulton does not teach or suggest this feature of the independent claims. Cosatto et al. do not provide the deficiency in the Moulton reference, nor does it teach or suggest such a solution. Therefore, the applicant asserts that neither Cosatto nor Moulton teach or suggest, alone or in combination the features of independent claims 1 or 25 as amended.

In the previous office action claims 15-23 and 25-43 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cosatto et al. in view of Moulton in further view of Chai et al. As discussed previously neither Cosatto et al. nor Moulton teach, suggest or use a geometric component in a manner recited by claim 1. The Chai et al. reference does not remedy this deficiency. Therefore, any further features recited by these claims pertaining to the geometric component directly or indirectly are also not taught or suggested, and thereby, in combination are separately patentable. Further, the Chai reference does not teach the feature of blending the texture at the boundaries of the plurality of subregions within a single image. In fact Chai makes no reference to subregions or blending within a single image.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that with this amendment the independent claims 1,25 and 35 are now in condition for allowance. Each of the dependent claims add further features which when combined with the respective independent claim and any intervening claims is believed separately patentable. In particular, it is noted that dependent claims 44-47 have been added which clearly are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-47 are respectfully requested.

An extension of time is hereby requested for responding to the Final Office Action and submitting an Request For Continued Examination in this case. A charge authorization for the extension of time fee is included herewith.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:NMR:mek